

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

---

ARLEEN MOORE,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Civ. A. No. 18-15183-BRM-TJB
GTECH CORPORATION, <i>et al.</i> ,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	<b>MEMORANDUM ORDER</b>

---

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on Plaintiff’s Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 46), pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e).<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff argues the Court overlooked factual allegations in denying her motion for injunctive relief, namely, the issue of “whether the ticket in question[] is a winning ticket, and whether defendant’s refusal to award Plaintiff the winning amount with said ticket amounts to a due process and equal protection violation, thus constituting irreparable harm.” (ECF No. 46, at 2.) Plaintiff contends “[t]his conduct, in essence, amounts to stealing [her] property without providing [her] with any forms of due process.” (*Id.* at 5.)

Plaintiff fails to raise any issue the Court may have overlooked that would warrant reconsideration of its prior opinion. Accordingly, for the reasons set forth herein and in the Court’s March 20, 2019 Order, and for good cause appearing,

---

<sup>1</sup> Motions for reconsideration are not expressly recognized in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, *United States v. Compaction Sys. Corp.*, 88 F. Supp. 2d 339, 345 (D.N.J. 1999), but are allowed by this District’s Local Civil Rule 7.1(i) if there are “matters or controlling decisions which counsel believes the Judge . . . has overlooked.” L.Civ.R. 7.1(i); *Dunn v. Reed Grp., Inc.*, No. 08-1632, 2010 WL 174861, at \*1 (D.N.J. Jan 13, 2010). Generally, a motion for reconsideration is treated as a motion to alter or amend judgment under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 59(e) or as a motion for relief from judgment or order under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). *See Holsworth v. Berg*, 322 F. App’x 143, (3d Cir. 2009) (construing motion for reconsideration as the functional equivalent of a Rule 59(e) motion to alter or amend a judgment which requires either “(1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence not available previously; or (3) the need to correct clear error of law or prevent manifest injustice”).

**IT IS** on this 2nd day of April 2019,

**ORDERED** that Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration (ECF No. 34) is **DENIED**.

/s/ *Brian R. Martinotti*

**HON. BRIAN R. MARTINOTTI**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**